

Remarks

Claim 42 was amended to include those limitations originally found in claim 43, since claim 43 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 42 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Claim 55 was amended to include those limitations originally found in claim 56, since claim 56 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 55 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Claim 57 was amended to include those limitations originally found in claim 58, since claim 58 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 57 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Claim 70 was amended to include those limitations originally found in claim 71, since claim 71 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 70 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Newly added claim 85 includes those limitations originally found in claim 45. Since claim 45 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 85 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Newly added claim 86 includes those limitations originally found in claim 60. Since claim 60 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 86 is now in proper condition for allowance.

All other claims were previously allowed.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of

narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,
Baum, ET AL.

by: 

Kenneth A. Haas
Reg. No. 42,614
Phone: (847) 576-6937
FAX: (847) 576-3750